



## Interview Summary

Application No. 09/138,146

Applicant(s)

Sheila V.Clark

Group Art Unit 2815

Baillie et al

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):
(1) Sheila V.Clark (3)
(2) Anthony Grillo (4)
Date of Interview Jun 13, 2001
Type: a) ☑ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference c) ☐ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) \( \subseteq \text{Yes} \) e) \( \mathbb{X} \) No. If yes, brief description:
Claim(s) discussed:
Identification of prior art discussed:
Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.
Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:
It was suggested to Mr. Grillo that he consider incorporating more specific features relative to the structure of the base and inner well so that this application may be further considered for allowance. The claims as they are broadly recited fail
to recite features of the invention specific to novelty and currently read on many type of structures.
·
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)
i) It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).
Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

BEST AVAILABLE COPY